REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-52, allowed claims 1-34, rejected claims 35, 41 and 47, and objected to claims 36-40, 42-46, and 48-52. This paper requests entry of an amendment that would amend claim 50 as per the Office action, leaving claims 1-52 in the application.

Applicant contends that the amendment is consistent with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.116 and therefore should be entered. More particularly, it does not touch the merits of the application; it does not raise any new issues; it does not require any further searching of prior art; and it places the application in condition for allowance.

Objections to the claims

At paragraph 1 of the Office action, claim 50 is objected to for an erroneous dependency. With this paper, claim 50 is changed to depend from claim 49, as per the Office action.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

At paragraph 3 of the Office action, claims 35, 41 and 47 are rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Akazawa (U.S. Pat. No. 5,111,479).

Claims 35, 41 and 47 recite that the originally recited squaring or similar operation for providing a data-wiped signal is followed by a coherent processing of the data-wiped signal. Applicant respectfully submits that Akazawa does not teach or suggest performing a coherent processing of a data-wiped signal, but instead teaches only band-pass filtering of a signal using filter element 3 in order to extract only the carrier component of a spread spectrum communication wave. (See col. 2, line 57, and col. 3, ll. 5-9, and also Fig. 2C.) It is clear from the specification throughout (see e.g. page 12, second paragraph,

defining coherent processing as a process in which consecutive signal data points are summed after possibly being multiplied by factors that may depend on frequency, the process being implemented as e.g. by an integrate and dump module followed by a filter, or by a lowpass filter followed by a downsampler) that the step of coherent processing is performed using digital signal processing, and yet nowhere in Akazawa is there ever even any suggestion that the filtering performed by (band pass) filter element 3 is anything but conventional analog signal processing (using a network of only passive electrical components, i.e. e.g. only resistors and capacitors). (Indeed, nowhere does Akazawa ever mention coherent processing or even digital signal processing of any sort.)

The Examiner nevertheless asserts that Akazawa's teaching of filtering a data-wiped signal anticipates providing a data-wiped signal is followed by a coherent processing of the data-wiped signal as in claim 35, 41 and 47 based on applicant's attorney's remark in response to the previous Office action, to wit, "At page 16, first full paragraph, it is explained that the (second) coherent processing performed following the squaring or similar operation serves as a filter." Applicant respectfully submits that to say, as applicant's attorney has said, that a step of coherent processing serves as a filter is not at all the same thing as saying that a filter (i.e. any filter) performs a step of coherent processing. Different filters perform different functions, and in particular, not all filters perform coherent processing. Certainly the filter disclosed in Akazawa is never indicated as performing coherent processing, or any other form of digital signal processing.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §102 of claims 35, 41, and 47, all as amended here, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the

claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Jan. 28, 2004

Date

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

James A. Retter, Reg. No. 41,266
tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955